APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09831555	8/14/01	KUMAR, BALBIR	540-311

EXAMINER
Michael C. Wimer

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

ART UNIT	PAPER
2821	20080508

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 8/15/2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

/Michael C. Wimer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2821

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

In re Patent Application of

KUMAR   Atty. Ref.: SCS-540-311

Serial No. 09/831,555   TC/A.U.: 2821

Filed: August 14, 2001   Examiner: M. Wimer

For: SCANNING OF ELECTROMAGNETIC BEAMS

* * * * * * * * * * *

August 15, 2007

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REPLY BRIEF

This Reply Brief is responsive to the Supplemental Examiner's Answer mailed

June 15, 2007, the date of response to which is August 15, 2007. The "Supplemental

Examiner's Answer" (which, in fact, appears to be responsive to the Appeal Brief filed

November 12, 2004) sets forth numerous admissions and raises new points of argument

which will be addressed in the order that they appear.

In section 11 on page 3 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner admits "it is

recognized what the Briggenshaw reference does **not show** from the discussion on page

6, first two paragraphs . . ." (emphasis added). Appellant's Appeal Brief on page 6, first

paragraph, merely describes what Briggenshaw teaches. However, the second paragraph

(beginning with "However") points out what Briggenshaw does not teach, and the